EPA BROWNFIELDS GRANT
MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date: January 9, 2007 Revised Notes: January 17, 2007

Time: 1:15 P.M. to 2:40 P.M.

Place: City of Bremerton PW & Utilities Administration Office
3027 Olympus Drive, Bremerton WA 98310

Attendance: Joanne LaBaw, EPA Project Officer
David Cook, P.G. GeoEngineers, Inc.
Sean Trimble, P.G. GeoEngineers, Inc.
Dan Miller, PW & Utilities

PROPERTY PROFILE

Properties located at Section 14 Township 24N Range 1E Quarter 33 currently identified as 001, 20, 21, 22, and 23 on Kitsap County Parcel map BAY VIEW GARDEN TRACTS SUP and JOSEPH DALY GARDEN TRACTS, bounded by Thompson Drive to the west, Pennsylvania Avenue and residential properties to the east, the Port Washington Narrows waterway to the north, and another property parcel to the south. This site and adjacent properties currently are used for light industrial purposes and storage of various materials, including boat parts and metal debris. Historic uses include a coal gasification plant, petroleum bulk storage and distribution plant, concrete manufacturing plant, sheet metal fabricator, drum storage facilities, boat/vehicle repair facilities, sandblasting, painting, electroplating operations, and salvage yard. Immediate past owner was Paul & Margaret McConkey, Theodore and Marion Bloomberg, and E.B. & Ethel Lent.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I - ESA REPORT

The Sesko Property has five (5) significant environmental issues:

1. Fuel Farm has ten (10) AST's – 20,000 gallons each of petroleum storage tanks of the property **(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, these ten (10) AST's were removed by the Lent's in 1980);**
2. One (1) UST unknown size of tank **(According to Trip McConkey, this UST was removed by DOE)**;

3. Abandoned ship that is estimated to have 30,000 gallons of fuel aboard **(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, the product aboard this abandoned ship was removed by Global Diving & Salvage + the ship is now under the ownership/custody of the USCG);**
4. Pontoon tanks on the waterfront/beach **(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, the pontoon tanks were removed from the beachfront and disposed of off-site)**; and
5. An oil dock and associated piping leading to the oil dock located on the beach.**(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, the piping leading to the oil dock is still entitled to the Bloomberg's and not included in the title transfer to the McConkey's at time of sale).**

The McConkey Property has approximately seventeen (17) tanks that are related to the property according to the Sanborn Map. **(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, these tanks were initially owned and operated by 1.) Bremerton Gas Company (private firm) then transferred to 2.) Western Gas Company and then 3.) Puget Power. Puget Power was approached about these tanks by DOE and City some time back. Now known as Puget Sound Energy, took exception to taking full responsibility for the tanks and suggested DOE and City discus this situation with the previous owners/operators, Bremerton Gas and Western Gas Companies. Apparently this discussion went mute).**

Known activities included sandblasting, electroplating operation … the electroplating location is presently unknown on the McConkey site. Mr. Trip McConkey may be able to give more information as to its location on the site and some drums scattered around the site as well. These were the main issues mentioned at this time.

(According to Trip McConkey on January 17th, the <u>electroplating operation</u> and its location remains unknown. The mentioned of the electroplating operation was made by the sandblasting operator to DOE to focus DOE's attention away from the questioned sandblasting operation. According to Trip, he has never met anyone involved in or around the site that recalls an electroplating operation).

In addition, the report cited wasted concrete that may be relative to the high PH levels; Gas collectors a big issue; creosote, sandblasting/metals/grit; electroplating operation and Cyanide.

Other concerns: Piping from the Gas Plant to the Fuel Dock.

PHASE II ESA – THE NEXT STEP

A major need is to develop a historical Base Map of the entire site. The map that was provided in the report is cut off and not showing the gas collector and entire beach front as shown on the aerial photo.

<u>Stage I</u>

- Need a comprehensive Base Map of the area indicating all the historical wreaks; and
- Produce an Exploration Plan to overlay on top of the Base Map to include the waterfront.

<u>Stage II</u>

- Combine the TBA and the City's Grant Funds and implement the successes of the GeoEngineers/EPA's Rainer Valley sampling plan/method. The Rainer Valley Plan was very successful and used TBA funding for the soil sampling, and GeoEngineer's did the monitoring well installation. The soil sampling included both the surface and subsurface sampling.
- GeoEnginners in agreement with EPA caution the use of all the funding on contracted work but also maintain sufficient funds for GeoEngineer's engineering support to the City.
- Most of the cost of the next Assessment Phase will be used in the obtaining soil samples and the chemical analysis relative to the soil sampling.

As a result, it was proposed by GeoEngineers we need to do more than just surface sampling; EPA agreed.

To get the ball rolling, GeoEnginners proposed to install some monitoring wells through out the McConkey and Sesko site; approximately five (5) to six (6) monitoring wells were theoretically proposed by GeoEngineers. This would get a series of ground water sampling as well as indicate the directional flow of the groundwater while seeing if any tidewater influence is involved … tidewater influence probably not anticipated on the bluff.

After knowing what is happening with the groundwater, GeoEngineers proposes to return to perform the second phase soil sampling of petroleum contaminants … but this proposed sequence could be totally opposite (vise versa). The first phase is highly recommended to be Soil Sampling that shall indicate the hot spots. The hot spots will then be the basis (justification) to install the Monitoring Wells at there designated locations.

The big question is: What phase or method do we think we would get the best use of our limited funds?

The first phase to be considered is the installing monitoring wells (borings) in the known or suspected hot spots and collected soil and groundwater samples. This method will provide information that will result in further investigation (s) … by this method it is conceivable that it may take a minimum of three (3) iterations to identify the suspected areas that may, through the process eliminate, reduce or expand the suspected areas. The analyzed data will direct us to further delineation or further assessment.

EPA thought: It may be worth the expense to geo-probe the site to at least ten (10) feet. This is an expensive method. That may only yield limited information do to its depth of probing.

GeoEngineers recommends before doing anything immediately, a historical base map is needed to place these tanks and hot spots can be plotted on a grid-like pattern. This would instill confidence as to location of these wreaks while subdividing the lots for more manageability.

EPA's TBA funds, although limited, could be used to test petroleum contaminates in the soil samples. But neither the EPA -TBA funds (+/-$80K) or the City's grant funds should be expended doing strictly soil sampling! Approximately 80 soil samples is anticipated at $500/sample = $40K.

Should we test for tributyl-tin at the area where sandblasting operations were said to happen? EPA recommends we do test for tributyl-tin.

GeoEngineers asked, "What is our time frame?" City stated, Trip McConkey would like to see us on site come March. EPA stated prior to that happening, the SAP/QAPP Plan shall require approval.

The other thought by GeoEngineers is to focus on groundwater as the driver. By this GeoEngineers thought is to install at least four (4) monitoring wells and conduct soil sampling around the perimeter of the gas collector(s).

List target of CSC's … Contractor to install Monitoring Wells procured through GeoEngineers, while the EPA would pay the Laboratory to perform sample analysis through the eligibility of the EPA-Super Fund.

The City took on the procurement of a Surveyor to do the boundary map/topographic survey of the entire site … this will need to be done soon while GeoEngineers will be compiling the SAP submittal for review, concurrence , and approval of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) by EPA. GeoEngineers will provide such plan and submit to EPA.
(According to Trip McConkey, a partial upland topographic survey was done but does not include the entire site … probably not of any good use).

In conclusion to this meeting several action items were discussed and assigned as follows:

1. EPA will review the remaining available TBA Funding available to this project;

2. EPA will contact their Contractor to meet with GeoEngineers, and City to discuss the Sampling Plan, etc.;

3. GeoEngineers will develop the QAPP and submit to EPA for review, concurrence and approval. In addition to the QAPP the HSP and a NHPA should be completed and submitted to EPA as well; and

4. City to develop Survey Checklist to complete a Boundary Map/Topo survey of the entire site and procure a local surveyor to perform the aforementioned task. **(City sent on January 10th the Survey Checklist to GeoEngineers for review and comment prior to soliciting the professional services of a local survey firm).**

NOTE: Any significant errors or omissions should be directed to the originator of this report.

NOTE: The "**Bolded"** remark(s) are from recent developments that have transpired from these meeting notes. The conversation with Trip McConkey was via a telephone on Wednesday, January 17th.

1/19/07

Dan Miller, City of Bremerton PW & Utils. Date